REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-22 have been rejected.

Applicants provide a computer method and system for analyzing spoken utterances directed to speech-enabled applications. According to the computer method and system, a grammatic specification is generated based on a domain model that is suitable for processing the spoken utterances and based on a syntax template for the domain model. The syntax template 72 tells a syntax manager 62 how to take the general syntax template 72 and turn it into a more specific grammatic specification (e.g., a Backus Naur Form (BNF) grammar) based on information in the domain model 70. Specification, page 14, line 23 through page 15, line 6.

Next, a recognition message, based on one of the spoken utterances recognized by a speech engine, is processed to produce an initial semantic representation of the recognized spoken utterance based on the grammatic specification and the domain model. An initial semantic representation is shown in frame structure form in the specification on page 16, lines 10-21. This initial semantic representation is then converted into a series of propositions.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loatman *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,914,590) ("Loatman") in view of *Wang et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,505,162) ("Wang").

The Office Action at Page 3 notes that Loatman does "not explicitly teach generating a grammatic specification based on a syntax template for the domain model."

Wang discloses a dialogue management module (103) that fits into a typical spoken dialogue system shown in FIG. 1 of Wang. A language understanding module (102) provides the dialogue management module (103) with a semantic representation of recognized sentences from a speech recognition module (101). As shown in FIG. 6 of Wang, a dialogue control unit (610) of the dialogue management module matches system states with dialogue states (602) within a hierarchical task description table (605), selects appropriate dialogue states based on the matching result (603), and performs the actions according to the selected dialogue states (604). Col. 6, lines 34-43.

Thus, Wang discloses a dialogue manager of the dialogue management module (103) that derives response actions as a function of the dialogue states from the hierarchical task description tables. Wang, however, fails to teach or suggest generating a grammatic specification suitable

for processing a spoken utterance based on a domain model and based on a syntax template for the domain model as claimed in base Claim 1. Indeed, Wang fails to teach the implementation details of the language understanding module (102), which is the focus of Applicant's claimed invention. Wang instead focuses entirely on the implementation details of the dialogue management module (103). Because Loatman and Wang, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "generating a grammatic specification suitable for processing the spoken utterances based on a domain model . . . and based on a syntax template for the domain model" as recited in base Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of base Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Base Claims 8, 15, and 22 include similar limitations as base Claim 1 and are allowable for the same reasons as base Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of base Claims 8, 15, and 22 be withdrawn.

Since Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from base Claim 1, Claims 9-12 and 14 depend from base Claim 8, and Claims 16-19 and 21 depend from base Claim 15, they are allowable for the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-19, 21, and ~~23~~ 22 be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the §103 rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21-22 is believed to be overcome. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 13 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loatman in view of Wang as applied to claims 1, 12 and 19 above and further in view of Phillips *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,519,562) ("Phillips").

As explained above, Loatman and Wang, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "generating a grammatic specification suitable for processing the spoken utterances based on a domain model . . . and based on a syntax template for the domain model" as recited in base Claims 1, 8, and 15. Phillips does not add to Loatman and Wang "generating a grammatic specification suitable for processing the spoken utterances based on a domain model . . . and based on a syntax template for the domain model of a speech-enabled application" as recited in base Claims 1, 8 and 15. Thus, no combination of Loatman, Wang and Phillips make the claimed invention obvious. Since Claims 6, 13 and 20 depend from base Claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively, they are allowable for the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 6, 13 and 20 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all pending claims (Claims 1-22) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Pamela A. Porpey (45,736) for
Mary Lou Wakimura
Registration No. 31,804
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: Sept. 5, 2006